ERIC Document Resume	See Instruction Sheet	DATE OF RESUME 8/4/65	DATE RECEIVED

A. PUBLICATION DATA

1. ERIC NUMBER	2. ORIGINATOR CONTROL NO(S).	3. IDENTIFICATION NO.	DO NOT WRITE IN SPACE BELOW
ED000381	7133	N.A.	

4. AUTHOR(S):
N.A.

5. TITLE OF DOCUMENT ABSTRACTED:
Predictive Criteria for Teacher Effectiveness

6. PUBLICATION TITLE:
Reports of the 12th Workshop on Teacher Effectiveness

7. EDITOR(S):
KH N.A.

8. PLACE OF ORIGIN
ORG. Univ. of Minn.
ST. Minneapolis, Minn.
CITY, STATE
TELE. EXT.
INST/LCC CODE

9. PUBLISHER OR SOURCE
University of Minnesota

10. VOL.	11. PAGES	12. MO./YR.	13. TOTAL PP.
N.A.	27-41	Aug. 59	15

MICROFILM COPY AVAILABLE
YES [X] NO [ ]

COPYRIGHT GRANTED
YES [ ] NO [X]

COPYRIGHT RELEASE FILED
YES [ ] NO [ ]

TYPE OF REPORT
PROPOSAL [ ]
IN-PROGRESS [ ]
FINAL [X]
FOLLOW-UP [ ]

OTHER ERIC REFERENCES:

ERIC SATELLITE CODE

B. INDEXING DATA

14. SUBJECT AREA

15. TYPE OF ENDEAVOR
experimental study

16. INDEXING TERMS (0-12)

experimental studies G-23	measurement O-12		
teachers Y-21	personality P-08		
effectiveness G-12	intelligence S-19		

17. ABSTRACT (MAX. 280 WORDS)

Report emphasizing personality, intelligence, scholastic records, and miscellaneous and combined data as criteria for teacher effectiveness. Presents tabular description of various personality investigations with correlations between effectiveness measures and scales on selected personality inventories, and tabular summary of correlational and quantitative results of intelligence and scholastic investigations. Reviews results of miscellaneous and combined teacher competence tests. Presents selected bibliography on related topics.

ERIC No.

18. SOURCE OF ABSTRACT

C. FUNDING DATA

19. SUPPORTING ORGANIZATION	20. DIVISION OR DEPT.	21. CONTRACT NO. / PROJECT NO.
	22. TOTAL COST OF PROJECT	
	23. DURATION OF PROJECT	U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Office of Education

ERIC Form 1

Reports of the 12th Workshop on Teacher [redacted] Education
University of Minn, Minneapolis, Minn 1959

IV.

PREDICTIVE CRITERIA FOR TEACHER EFFECTIVENESS

The testing of persons in order to determine their interests, attitudes, and capabilities has now been practiced in one way or another, or in many ways, for over a generation. Often such testing has been used in a program of admission to a field of specialized training. In order to determine the validity of these predicitive devices, Dr. Robert Hill, Jr. made and submitted this study to Seminar I. The seminar expresses its thanks to Dr. Hill and submits the study here as an important document suggesting necessary further steps in the formulation and use of predictive instruments.

The problem of predicting teacher effectiveness or competency is quite obviously intimately related to the problem of selection and retention of teacher candidates. If such prediction can be accurately made, early identification of likely prospects will be possible. Likewise, early identification of poor prospects will be possible, thus saving such a student the waste and embarrassment of pursuing a teacher-education curriculum for some time, only to be removed from such a program when deficiences become obvious.

Research literature in this area is quite voluminous. There are occasional single publications such as that by Morsh and Wilder (41), which served as the basic framework for some of the tabular data presented here. Of more continuing interest and value are the recurrent summaries contained in the Review of Educational Research. This journal operates in a cyclical fashion. Every three years the June issue contains a summary of studies in this area during the previous three years. Recently A.S. Barr (3,4) has been the senior author of these reviews, assisted by others.

The writer has sought a reasonable framework for presenting the variable data in this area. Several organizational dimensions are possible. It was felt, however, that studies of modest complexity would be most feasible, and that these might well be grouped around various commonly investigated aspects of the teacher. Consequently, this report emphasizes four general areas: (1) Personality, (2) Intelligence, (3) Scholastic records, and (4) Miscellaneous and combined data.

Personality

Personality criteria of teaching effectiveness seem to have yielded results which vary widely. Summary results are grouped according to the measure used. Quantitative results are summarized in Table I. Correlations between effectiveness measures and different scales on the Bernreuter Personality Inventory vary from the -.25 region to the +.30 region. High scores on the Bell and Thurstone instruments indicate poor personal adjustment. Hence,

ED000381

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

if good adjustment is related to effectiveness, negative correlations would be expected. Magnitudes have varied from about -.50 to a study by Gould (25) yielding a coefficient of contingency of .37. In the later case it appears that the score direction has been reversed to make it correspond to other variables employed. Gould cautions that the personality measures have low forecasting efficiency. The Rorschach study of Cooper and Lewis (15) results in a tetrachoric correlation of .52. However, the authors caution that using the neurotic aspects for individual prediction is not recommended because of the wide overlap of Rorschach factors. Page and Travers (44) assert that they found no Rorschach pattern related to any category of performance in student teaching.

The MMPI categories, when unselected, were found by Michaelis and Tyler (40) to give correlations varying between -.36 and .14. Using selected items, Callis (8) achieved correlations of the general magnitude of .40.

The Leeds instrument, employed by Leeds (35), and Cook and Leeds (12), achieved correlations in the .40's, together with item analysis. The effectiveness measure for the analysis was principals' ratings of best and worst teachers.

Working with the MTAI by Callis (8) has shown varying correlations depending upon effectiveness criteria. Another investigator, Day (19), used criterion ratings from principals and supervisors. He asserts that the MTAI has very little predictive power, being only about an 8% improvement over chance.

A number of other personality instruments have been used without notable success. Several of these are included only in the bibliography, because of time and space considerations, viz., Pressey (47), Rudisill (24) Occupational Personality Inventory (20,21), Washburne Social Adjustment Inventory (49), Jackson Social Proficiency (31), and Willoughby Emotional Maturity Scale (54).

One of the most comprehensive studies, by Lamke (32) used Cattell's 16 Personality Factor Test. He employed both factor analysis and discriminant function analysis. His failure to find characteristic personality patterns for either good or poor teachers may point quite precisely to the central problem. It may be that a "balance" among traits is needed for a superior teacher, and that this balance may be achieved in widely varying fashions, depending upon situational factors such as subject matter, grade level, and community peculiarities.

Barker (2) concludes in a somewhat similar vein that teaching engenders many different kinds of personality strains, and that varied patterns of adjustment are needed.

Grim and Hoyt (26) feel that the most crucial competencies are in the realm of social and emotional behaviors, which are clearly related to personality.

Lawson (33) investigated the use of "character evaluation" in 1949, concluding that only in 42 of 237 cases was there any really systematic approach. He further found that the validity of such investigations was widely held to be suspect.

Table I
Personality Investigations

Author	Sample of Teachers	Criterion	Correlations Bernreuter Personality Inventory N	S	I	D	FC	FS
Laycock (1934)	80 student	Practice Teaching Grades	-.21	.05	-.14	.33		
Phillips (1935)	173 elementary & junior high	Average Supt. & Principal Ratings	-.09	.04	.07			
Ward & Kirk (1942)	95 student	Superior Rating	-.11	-.24	-.08	.04	.02	-.11
		Critic Teacher Rating	.09	-.23	.01	.00	.08	-.11
			Bell Adjustment Inventory					
Seagoe (1945)	31 student	Practice Teaching Rating	-.40					
Gould (1947)	92 with one year experience	Principal Rating	.37					
			Thurstone Personality Schedule					
Seagoe (1946)	25 student	Administrator Ranking	-.55					
			Rorschach					
Cooper & Lewis (1951)	30 high and 30 low in secondary 153 student	Pupil Rating	Absence of neurotic sign .52 Personality maladjustment NS Percentage of determinant NS Human Movement response NS					
			MMPI					
Michaelis & Taylor (1951)	56 student women	Supervisor Rating	9 subscores -.36 to .14 (selected items)					
Callis (1952)	77 elementary	Student Rating	.41					
		Observer Rating	.41					
		Principal Rating	.38					
			Leeds Teacher-Pupil Inventory					
Cook & Leads (1947) Leeds (1950)	100 unselected	Pupil Rating	.45					
		Principal Rating	.43					
		Expert's Rating	.49					
			MTAI					
Callis (1952)	77 elementary	Student Rating	.49					
		Observer Rating	.40					
		Principal Rating	.19					

Intelligence

Efforts to relate intelligence to teacher competence have had a long and undistinguished history. Such efforts seem perfectly reasonable, and are based on what appears to be an obvious relationship. The "common sense" of this assumption is so appealing that despite a plethora of research studies which cast grave doubt upon this criterion, it is still in widespread use today.

The general finding is a low positive correlation; the magnitude being far below that needed for reliable individual prediction. Morsh and Wilder (41:64-5) have summarized 42 correlational studies, each of which involved groups of teachers numbering 90 or more. Of these, 37 were positive, ranging to a high of .48 in a study conducted in 1923 with student teachers. The vast majority were below .30. The other five were negative, ranging to -.08.

Since the results of such studies are so easily understandable, only the summary of quantitative results is shown in Table II.

There may be several speculations as to why this is so. It may be that intellectual factors fade into insignificance compared to the personality or human relations aspects of dealing with students. There is some evidence that intelligence may operate differentially, brighter teachers being more effective with brighter students, and less bright teachers being more effective with less bright students. It may be that the range of intelligence among teachers is too limited, as this would spuriously deflate correlation coefficients. There is little question but what teachers (when compared to the general population) are a highly selected and homogeneous group.

Although intelligence has been shown quite clearly to be inadequate as a single predictor, it may find its best use as one of several factors combined. The combination might take a number of forms, such as expectancy tables, multiple cut-off points, multiple regression equations, factor analysis, etc. The usefulness of intelligence will be enhanced if it can be combined with other predictive measures which have little or no correlation with it.

Table II
Intelligence Investigations

Investigator	Teacher Sample	Post	Criterion Measure*	Correlation
Hamrin (1927)	108	Army Alpha	Rating	.20
Breckinridge (1931)	420 (begin)		Grade	.09
	(advanced)		Grade	-.04
Collins (1930)	104	Thurstone	Grade	.34
Cooper (1924)	107		Grade	.22 (Contingency coefficient)
Pyle (1928)	99 (1 yr. exp.)	Detroit Advanced	Principal	.03
	99 (2 yrs. exp.)		estimate	.02
Coxe & Cornell (1933)	9000	Terman	Grade	.06
Bent (1937)	597	Miller Analogies	Rating	.20
Major (1938)	122	Ohio State	Grade	.14
Phillips (1935)	173 elem. & jr. high	Ohio State	Administrator ratings	.33
Wagenhorst (1930)	191 (1 yr. exp.)	Otis	Superintendent	.00
Markt & Gilliland (1929)	143	Otis	Grade	.07
Martin (1944)	123 (1 yr. exp.)	ACE	Supt. Rating	.02
			Practice Teach.	.14
Seagoe (1946)	25 elem. (2 yrs. exp.)	ACE	Supervisor Rank	.10
Stephens & Lichtenstein (1947)	20 elem.	ACE	Pupil Gain	-.24
Bach (1952)	76 high sch. (1 sem. exp.)	ACE	Practice Teach.	.002
	55 high sch. (1 sem. exp.)	ACE	Principal Rating	-.01
			(2 different)	-.10
			Supt. Rating	-.01
			(2 different)	-.08

* Where "Grade" is the criterion measure, subjects were student teachers.

Scholastic

The assumption that past scholastic record is related to teaching competence is about as attractive as the similar assumption about intelligence.

The scholastic record in question may be either general college grade point average, or the GPA in selected courses. In case selected courses are used, they are ordinarily courses in the education department, i.e., professional courses. There is, of course, a relationship among grades earned in various courses. The common factors involved here are, in all likelihood, such things as intelligence, motivation, personality, etc.

Results of studies here are quite similar to studies relating to intelligence. In general, there appears to be a low positive correlation between teaching effectiveness and past scholastic record. Once again the correlations are so low as to contraindicate the use of this criterion alone for predictive purposes.

Again it may be concluded that since correlations are generally positive and low, scholarship measures might profitably be combined with other measures in multivariate prediction. Such a conclusion is reasonable, and appears to be fairly common practice. However, there is at least one noteworthy limitation. Scholarship records will not be of appreciable predictive help if measures are already being used which correlate highly with scholarship. Perhaps the most obvious of these is intelligence, or scholastic aptitude. Unfortunately it is precisely these two types of measures which form the nucleus of selective and predictive criteria for many teacher-education institutions. This situation is not necessarily to be deplored, particularly in view of the uncertain nature of predictive criteria for teaching competence. If effective other measures not so highly correlated with scholarship can be devised or discerned, however, they would probably make a much more efficient conbination with scholarship than does the currently common scholarship-intelligence combination.

Since the investigations are correlational and easily understandable, only the pertinent quantitative data are presented, and these in summary form in Table III.

Table III
Scholastic Investigations

Investigator	Sample	Criterion Measure	All College GPA	Professional Courses GPA
Ullman (1930)	116 hi sch 1 sem exp	Adm. rating	.30	.30
Bossing (1931)	100 hi sch	Adm. rating	.17	.19
Hardesty (1934)	231	Supt. rating	.15	.09
Seagoe (1946)	25 elem 2 yrs exp	Supervisor rank	.03	.01
Schwartz (1950)	18 2 yrs exp	Supervisor rating	.24	.02
Vach (1952)	70 hi sch 1 sem exp	Prin. rating	-.01	.09
		2 different scales	-.06	-.02
		Supt. rating	.08	-.08
		2 raters; same scale	.00	-.01

Miscellaneous and Combined

Many investigators have sought combinations of measures which would be effective in predicting teacher competence. Many have also chosen measures other than those most common, which have been indicated above.

One of the apparently excellent examinations designed expressly for teacher competence is the National Teachers Examination. Flanagan (23) found a correlation of .51 on this instrument, using superintendents' ratings as the criterion. He also reports coefficients significant at .05 using pupil ratings as the criterion. However, Lins (36) used the National Teachers Examination and found a correlation of -.30 where pupil evaluations of teachers served as the criterion. This he reported significant at the .01 level. The deadly result of such widely conflicting findings scarcely needs to be emphasized.

The Coxe-Orleans Aptitude Test was used by Phillips (45) in 1935, Cooke (13) in 1937, and Seagoe (55) in 1946. The criterion in all these cases was rating or ranking by supervisors. Correlations varied from -.32 to .51, others being .16, .04, -.12, .28, and .01.

The Stanford Aptitude Test was used by Rolfe (49) in 1945 and Seagoe (55) in 1946. Both used elementary teachers, with Rolfe using pupil gain as the criterion; Seagoe using supervisor ranking. On the three subtests of the instrument Rolfe found correlations of -.15, -.13, and .08. Seagoe found correlations of .02, .04, and .14. Seagoe also used the George Washington University Aptitude Test at the same time, with elementary teachers and supervisor ranking as the criterion. In this instance, the correlation was -.19.

Interest measures have likewise fared rather badly. In the same study, Seagoe used the Strong Interest blank, finding a correlation of -.08. In 1948, Espenschade (22) also used the Strong with 46 physical education teachers who had had 1 year of experience. The criterion was supervisor rating; the correlation .07.

Combinations of data have also been used. Clinker (10) studied 115 teachers in 1957, using the MTAI, the ACE, the Mooney Problem Check list, and college scholastic achievement. The teachers were rated into a high and low group. He found significance at .05 for only the scholastic achievement and the number of personal problems. The MTAI scores dropped significantly with successful teachers during a two year period.

Cummings (17) also used an upper and lower division of teachers, with still more records, viz., Sophomore English test, ratings by supervisors, reasons why teaching was chosen, grades in professional courses, general academic achievement, peer social acceptance, self adjustment, and critic teacher rating. He found no significant differences, although ironically enough, lower GPA tended to indicate greater peer acceptance.

In an effort to discover differences between teacher candidates and other curricular groups, Nothern (42) studied eight curricular groups, considering variables of sex, intelligence, high school achievement, college achievement, and 8 types of test score data. Seventeen of 19 differences were found to be significant, and those favored curricular groups other than teacher candidates. Two differences favored other groups, but were not significant. Only one of the total of 20 differences favored teacher-candidates, and this difference was not significant.

Carlile (9) used student teaching grades as the criterion for an investigation involving measures of intelligence, teaching aptitude (Coxe-Orleans), scholastic achievement, proficiency in basic skills, and personality (Allport A-S Reaction, Bell, Bernreuter). He found all correlations low, the highest being with scholastic achievement. However, Massey and Vineyard (39A) found the relationship between scholastic achievement and (rated) first year teaching success too low for predictive purposes.

Ohlsen and Schultz (43) concluded that sociometric data may hold some promise for predicting student teacher excellence. Their investigation, however, has relatively little quantification. Moreover, one may feel some chagrin when relating this assertion to the findings of Cummings noted above.

Upshall (59) contends that global and composite faculty judgment in relatively effective. Such judgments were related to objective data, chiefly concerned with aspects of scholarship and intelligence. Reports in these areas above cannot reasonably be said to be very encouraging.

The factor analytic approach has recently gained in popularity. Nine studies (1, 27, 30, 32, 48, 50, 51, 52, 56) which report results of this type of effort have given rise to a number of factors for which names have had to be devised. Typical of these are "empathy," "professional maturity," and "problems in response set." The factor analysis approach is without much question a statistically powerful one. However, at this time there is still quite a gap between isolating a "factor" and being able to measure it with enough precision to warrant its use as a predictor.

The rather bleak present state of affairs need not be entirely discouraging. It, of course, indicates the need for further research. The future trends of such research may rest upon a triad of problem areas. This is a speculation, however, and not supported by verificable data. The suggested triad is: (a) Criterion research. Until more reliable and valid criteria are delineated, research will be continuously handicapped. (b) Refined statistical techniques. As is indicated above, factor analysis is symbolic of progress in techniques which may eventually enable investigators to handle complex human factors with greater ease. (c) Basic theorization in behavior. As theoretical bases are enlarged, research inspiration and direction is increased. We are as yet far from delving into primary factors in the complex of teaching and learning.

For the present (for moderately sophisticated investigators) it would seem advisable to continue efforts at prediction using empirical criteria of relative teaching success. Against these criteria one might attempt statistical techniques which maximize the predictive power of several related factors, each of which has too small a relationship with teaching to be a significant predictor by itself. Examples of this would be multiple regression and discriminatory analysis. Merely because we have not met with notable success up to this time does not excuse concerned professional investigators from efforts to pursue new knowledge in this area.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Bach, J. O., "Practice Teaching Success in Relation to Other Measures of Teaching Ability," Journal of Experimental Education, 21:57-80, 1952.

2. Barker, M. E., "Summary of the Relation of Personality Adjustment of Teachers to their Efficiency in Teaching," Journal of Educational Research, 41:664-675, 1948.

3. Barr, Arvil S., et. al., "The Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Efficiency," Review of Educational Research, 25:261-269, June, 1955.

4. Barr, Arvil S., et. al., "The Measurement and Prediction of Teacher Efficiency," Review of Educational Research, 28:256-264, June, 1958.

5. Bent, R. K., "Relationships Between Qualifying Examinations, Various Other Factors, and Student Teaching Performance at the University of Minnesota," Journal of Experimental Education, 5:251-255, 1937.

6. Bossing, N. L., "Teacher-Aptitude Tests and Teacher Selection," U.S. Office of Education Bulletin, No. 12, 1931.

7. Breckinridge, E., "A Study of the Relation of Preparatory School Records and Intelligence Test Scores to Teaching Success," Educational Administration and Supervision, 17:649-660, 1931.

8. Callis, R., et. al., "Studies on the Effectiveness of Teaching," in Differential Characteristics of the More Effective and Less Effective Teachers. A Summary Report of Nine Studies, Washington, D. C., U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1953.

9. Carlile, A. B., "Predicting Performance in the Teaching Profession," Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 47, May 1954.

10. Clinker, B. K., "An Experimental Study of Selected Factors Important in Successful Teaching," Dissertation Abstracts, 18(1958) 508.

11. Collins, E. A., "Relation of Intelligence to Success in Teaching," School and Community, 16:155-157, 1930.

12. Cooke, D.H., "How Do Teachers Rate Themselves?" Educational Administration and Supervision, 23:473-476, 1937.

13. Cook, W. W. and C. H. Leeds, "Measuring the Teaching Personality," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 7:399-410, 1947.

14. Cooper, H. E., "Correlation of the Grades in Practice Teaching Received by Seniors in a College for Teachers With Their Scores in the Thurstone Group Intelligence Test," Pedagogical Seminary, 31:176-182, 1924.

15. Cooper, J. G., and R. B. Lewis, "Quantitative Rroschach Factors in the Evaluation of Teacher Effectiveness," Journal of Educational Research, 44:703-707, 1951.

16. Coxe, W. W., and E. L. Cornell, "The Prognosis of Teaching Ability of Students in New York State Normal Schools," University of the State of New York Bulletin, No. 1033, 1933.

17. Cummings, R. R., "An Analysis of Certain Selected Factors Characteristic of Students Who Succeeded in Teacher Education at Ball State Teachers College," Dissertation Abstracts, (1957) 101.

18. Davies, Don (ed.), "Reviews of Recent Research in Teacher Education," unpublished bibliographic compilation, University of Minnesota, 1959.

19. Day, H. P., "A Study of the Validity of the MTAI as a Predictive Instrument in the Selection of Good Teaching Prospects from Among College Under-Graduates," Dissertation Abstracts (1956) 781.

20. Dodge, A. F., "What are the Personality Traits of the Successful Teacher?" Journal of Applied Psychology, 27:325-337, 1943.

21. Dodge, A. F., "A Study of the Personality Traits of the Successful Teachers," Occupations, 27:107-112, 1948.

22. Espenschade, A., "Selection of Women Major Students in Physical Education," Research Quarterly, American Association of Health, 19:70-76, 1948.

23. Flanagan, J. C., "A Preliminary Study of the Validity of the 1940 Edition of the National Teacher Examinations," School and Society, 54:59-64, 1941.

24. Gotham, R. E., "Personality and Teaching Efficiency," Journal of Experimental Education, 14:157-165, 1945.

25. Gould, G., "The Predicitive Value of Certain Selective Measures," Educational Administration and Supervision, 33:208-212, 1947.

26. Grim, P. R., and C. J. Hoyt, "Appraisal of Teaching Competency," Educational Research Bulletin, 31:85-91, 1952.

27. Hampton, N. D., "An Analysis of Supervisory Ratings of Elementary Teachers Graduated from Iowa State Teachers College," Journal of Experimental Education, 20:179-215, 1951.

28. Hamrin, S. A., "A Comparative Study of Ratings of Teachers-In-Training and Teachers-In-Service," Elementary School Journal, 28:39-44, 1927.

29. Hardesty, C. D., "Can Teaching Success Be Related?" Nation's Schools, 15 (1), 1935.

30. Hellfritzsch, A. G., "A Factor Analysis of Teacher Abilities," Journal of Experimental Education, 14:166-199, 1945.

31. LaDuke, C. V., "The Measurement of Teaching Ability," (Study No. 3), Journal of Experimental Education, 14:75-100, 1945.

32. Lamke, T. A., "Personality and Teaching Success," Journal of Experimental Education, 20:217-259, 1951.

33. Lawson, D., "A Study of Selective Admission Based Upon Character Evaluation as Practiced in Teacher Training Institutions Through-out the United States," Educational Administration and Supervision, 35:421-426, 1949.

34. Laycock, S. R., "The Bernreuter Personality Inventory in the Selection of Teachers," Educational Administration and Supervision, 20:59-63, 1934.

35. Leeds, C. H., "A Scale for Measuring Teacher-Pupil Attitudes and Teacher-Pupil Rapport," Psychological Monographs, 64, No. 6, 1950.

36. Lins, L. J., "The Prediction of Teaching Efficiency," Journal of Experimental Education, 15:2-60, 1946.

37. Major, C. L., "The Percentile Ranking on the Ohio State University Psychological Test as a Factor in Forecasting the Success of Teachers in Training," School and Society, 47:582-584, 1938.

38. Markt, A. R., and A. R. Gilliland, "A Critical Analysis of the George Washington University Teaching Aptitude Test," Educational Administration and Supervision, 15:660-666, 1929.

39. Martin, L. O., The Prediction of Success for Students in Teacher Education, New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1944.

40. Massey, H. W., and E. E. Vineyard, "Relationship Between Scholarship and First Year Teaching Success," Journal of Teacher Education, 9:298-300, 1958.

41. Michaelis, J. U., and F. T. Tyler, "MMPI and Student Teaching," Journal of Applied Psychology, 35:122-124, 1951.

42. Morsh, Joseph E., and Eleanor W. Wilder, Identifying the Effective Instructor, United States Air Force, 1954.

43. Nothern, E. F., "A Statistical Analysis of Differences Between Students Preparing to Teach and Students Preparing to Enter Other Occupational Fields," unpublished dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1954.

44. Ohlsen, M. M., and R. E. Schultz, "A Study of Variables for Use in Selection (of Teachers)" Journal of Teacher Education, 5:279-282, 1954.

45. Page, M. H., and R. Travers, "Relationship Between Rorschach Performance and Student Teaching," Journal of Educational Psychology, 44:31-40, 1953.

46. Phillips, W. S., "An Analysis of Certain Characteristics of Active and Prospective Teachers," Geo. Peabody College Contribution to Education, No. 161, 1935.

47. Pyle, W. H., "The Relation Between Intelligence and Teaching Success: A Supplementary Study," Educational Administration and Supervision, 14:257-267, 1928.

48. Retan, G. A., "Emotional Instability and Teaching Success," Journal of Educational Research, 37:135-141, 1943.

49. Ringness, T. A., "Relationships Between Certain Attitudes Toward Teaching and Teaching Success," Journal of Experimental Education, 21:1-55, 1952.

50. Rolfe, J. F., "The Measurement of Teaching Ability," (Study No. 2), Journal of Experimental Education, 14:52-74, 1945.

51. Ryans, D. G., "A Study of Criterion Data," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 12:333-344, 1952.

52. Ryans, D. G., and E. Wandt, "Investigations of Personal and Social Characteristics of Teachers," Journal of Teacher Education, 3:228-231, 1952.

53. Schmid, J. Jr., "Factor Analyses of Prospective Teachers' Differences," Journal of Experimental Education, 18:287-319, 1950.

54. Schwartz, A. N., "A Study of the Discriminating Efficiency of Certain Tests of the Primary Personality Traits of Teachers," Journal of Experimental Education, 19:63-93, 1950.

55. Seagoe, M. V., "Prediction of In-service Success in Teaching," Journal of Educational Research, 39:658-663, 1946.

56. Seagoe, M. V., "Prognostic Tests and Teaching Success," Journal of Educational Research, 38:685-690, 1945.

57. Smalzried, N. T., and H. H. Remmers, "A Factor Analysis of the Purdue Rating Scale for Instructors," Journal of Educational Research, 34:363-367, 1943.

58. Stephens, J. M., and A. Lichtenstein, "Factors Associated with Success in Teaching Grade Five Arithmetic," Journal of Educational Research, 40:683-694, 1947.

59. Ullman, R. R., "The Prediction of Teaching Success," Educational Administration and Supervision, 16:598-608, 1930.

60. Upshall, C. C., "The Validity of Composite Faculty Judgment as a Method of Identifying Undesirable Prospective Elementary School Teachers," Journal of Educational Research, 35:694-699, 1942.

61. Wagenhorst, L. H. "The Relation Between Ratings of Student Teachers in College and Success in First Year of Teaching," Educational Administration and Supervision, 16:249-253, 1930.

62. Ward, L. B., and S. A. Kirk, "Studies in the Selection of Students for a Teachers College," Journal of Educational Research, 35:665-672, 1942.

V.

A RECOMMENDATION CONCERNING EMPLOYMENT OF UNSUCCESSFUL STUDENTS AS TEACHERS

The Seminar on Selective Admission and Retention in Professional Education also discussed the employment of unsuccessful students as teachers and the desirability of faculty members of institutions of teacher education having teaching experience at the elementary or secondary level. After studying both topics, the group drafted and adopted the following recommendations which were endorsed by all of the workshop participants at a general session.

The Seminar on Selective Admission and Retention in Professional Education notes that heavy demand for teachers sometimes results in the employment of personnel who possess substandard certification. Occasionally school systems may seek to employ persons who have tried unsuccessfully to complete their college preparation for the profession of teaching. In such instances the teacher-education institution has the responsibility of specifically informing the authorities concerned that the individual in question was thus far unsuccessful. Such information should be sent by the teacher-education institution to:

1) The superintendent of the school system
2) The president of the school board (or whatever lay organization is responsible for the total program of the school)
3) The state department which certifies teachers
4) The state education association which is affiliated with the NEA
5) The organization which accredits the school
6) The State Association of School Administrators

The basis for such action is the assumption that the teacher-education institution is duty-bound to disseminate such information because of its responsibility both to the profession of education and to the youth of the nation.

The Seminar on Selective Admission and Retention in Professional Education recommends that the faculty members of a teacher-education institution have pertinent and successful teaching experience at either the elementary or secondary level. Such experience would seem differentially advisable, being most crucial in those courses which are most directly related to the practice of teaching.

The members of Seminar 1 were:

C. E. Sear, Chairman
C. V. Heunemann, Recorder
Robert E. Hill, Jr.
Linford A. Marquart
Robert E. McAdam
Paul Nagel
Edwin C. Nelson
Evelyn D. Prescott